



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/702,303	10/31/2000	Weiya Luo	00-8008	1277

32127 7590 12/31/2003

VERIZON CORPORATE SERVICES GROUP INC.
C/O CHRISTIAN R. ANDERSEN
600 HIDDEN RIDGE DRIVE
MAILCODE HQEO3H14
IRVING, TX 75038

EXAMINER

BAYARD, DJENANE M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2141

DATE MAILED: 12/31/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/702,303

Applicant(s)

LUO ET AL.

Examiner

Djenane M Bayard

Art Unit

2141

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 October 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-53 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-53 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 31 October 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 4.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-6, 12-14, 20 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,591,337 to Dekoning et al.

a. As per claim 1,6, and 12, Dekoning et al teaches a method for managing a network, comprising: providing a first list of events occurring in the network (See col. 5, line 24-31); simultaneously providing a second list of events occurring in the network, the second list comprising a predetermined number of most recent events (See col. 3, lines 13-15 and col. 6, lines 1-8); and managing the network using the first and second lists (See col. 1, lines 45-47).

b. As per claims 2 and 13, Dekoning et al teaches setting a number of events to be provided in the second list (See col. 6, lines 1-8).

Art Unit: 2141

c. As per claim 3, Dekoning et al teaches selecting an event in the second list, and automatically selecting, in response to selecting an event in the second list, an equivalent event in the first list (See col. 5, lines 47-48).

d. As per claim 4, Dekoning et al teaches acknowledging the equivalent event in the first list (See col. 5, lines 54-58)

e. As per claim 5, Dekoning et al teaches wherein the first and second lists include events relating to at least one network element in the network (See abstract, lines 4-7 and col. 5, lines 24-26).

f. As per claim 14, Dekoning et al teaches a device for managing a network having a plurality of network elements, comprising: a memory configured to store instructions (See col. 2, lines 29-34); and a processor configured to execute the instructions to provide a list of identifiers associated with the plurality of network elements (See col. 2, lines 63-67), each network element identifier being associated with a state indication (See col. 5, lines 44-45).

g. As per claims 20 and 24, Dekoning et al teaches a method for managing a network having a plurality of network elements, comprising: receiving a request for network information (See abstract, lines 11-13); providing a list of network element: identifiers associated with the plurality of network elements (See col. 5, lines 44-46), the

Art Unit: 2141

list indicating a state of each of the plurality of network elements (See col. 10, lines 39-41); and managing the network using the list (See col. 1, lines 45-47).

3. Claims 26, 28-30, 32-34, 36-41, 43-46 and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No 6,343,290 to Cossins et al.

a. As per claims 26 and 34, Cossins et al teaches a method for managing a network having a plurality of-network devices comprising: associating events in the network with one of the plurality of network devices (See col. 3, lines 42-45); providing a geographical map, the geographical map displaying locations of each of the plurality of network devices (See col. 3, lines 33-35) and indicating which of the plurality of network devices are associated with at least one event (See col. 11, lines 29-34); and managing the network using the geographical map (See col. 3, lines 12-13).

b. As per claims 28, 32 and 36, Cossins et al teaches selecting a network device having at least one associated event (See col. 11, lines 29-34); and providing information regarding the at least one associated event (See col. 11, lines 43-54).

c. As per claims 29, 33 and 37, Cossins et al teaches wherein the geographical map further displays a state of each network device (See col. 11, lines 29-34).

Art Unit: 2141

d. As per claim 30, Cossins et al teaches a device for managing a network having a plurality of network devices, comprising: a memory configured to store instructions (See col. 8, lines 38-43); and a processor configured to execute the instructions to associate an event in the network with a network device (See col. 5, lines 28-31) and provide a geographical map, the geographical map displaying locations of network devices and indicating which network devices are associated with at least one event (See col. 3, lines 13-49).

e. As per claims 38,43 and 48, Cossins et al teaches a device for managing a network having a plurality of network elements, comprising: a memory configured to store instructions (See col. 8, lines 38-43); and a processor configured to execute the instructions to associate each network element with one of a plurality of logical planes and provide a network map, the network map displaying relationships between the plurality of logical planes and those network elements associated with the plurality of logical planes (See col. 10, lines 13-29).

f. As per claims 39 and 44, Cossins et al teaches wherein the plurality of logical planes includes one or more of a transmission plane, a switching plane, a customer access plane, and a signaling plane (See col. 10, lines 21-24).

Art Unit: 2141

g. As per claims 40 and 45, Cossins et al teaches wherein the processor is further configured to: allow a user to navigate through the network map (See abstract, lines 18-21).

h. As per claims 41 and 46, Cossins et al teaches wherein the processor is further configured to: display a state of each network element in the network map (See col. 11, lines 29-34).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 7-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,812,784 to Watson et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,591, 337 to Dekoning.

a. As per claim 7, Watson et al teaches a user device configured to transmit a request for current network information and a server configured to receive the request for current network information and provide the current network information to the user device (See col. 1, lines 32-37). However, Watson et al fails to teach providing a first list of events occurring; in the network, and simultaneously providing a second list of

events occurring in the network, the second list comprising a number of most recent events.

Dekoning et al teaches a method and apparatus for caching objects in a disparate management environment. Furthermore, Dekoning et al teaches providing a first list of events occurring in the network (See col. 5, lines 24-40), and simultaneously providing a second list of events occurring in the network, the second list comprising a number of most recent events (See col. 3, lines 13-15 and col. 6, lines 1-8)

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate providing a first list of events occurring; in the network, and simultaneously providing a second list of events occurring in the network, the second list comprising a number of most recent events as taught by Dekoning et al in the claimed invention of Watson et al in order to manage a plurality of subsystems within an information network (See col. 1, lines 45-47)

b. As per claim 8, Watson et al in view of Dekoning et al teaches the claimed invention as described above. Furthermore, Watson teaches wherein the request includes at least one network identifier (See col. 10, lines 45-49).

c. As per claim 9, Watson et al in view of Dekoning et al teaches the claimed invention as described above. Furthermore, Watson teaches wherein, when providing the current network information, the server is configured to: provide current network information relating to the at least one network identifier (See col. 10, lines 45-49).

d. As per claim 10, Watson et al in view of Dekoning et al teaches the claimed invention as described above. However, Watson fails to teach wherein the number of most recent events provided in the second list is set by a user.

Dekoning et al teaches a method and apparatus for caching objects in a disparate management environment. Furthermore, Dekoning et al teaches wherein the number of most recent events provided in the second list is set by a user (See col. 6, lines 1-6)

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate wherein the number of most recent events provided in the second list is set by a user as taught by Dekoning et al in the claimed invention of Watson et al in order to replaced the old objects in the list with newly retrieved objects (See col. 6, lines 10-12).

e. As per claim 11, Watson et al in view of Dekoning et al teaches the claimed invention as described above. However, Watson et al fails to teach wherein the user device is further configured to: select an event in the second list, and automatically select, in response to selecting an event in the second list, an equivalent event in the first list.

Dekoning et al teaches a method and apparatus for caching objects in a disparate management environment. Furthermore, Dekoning et al teaches wherein the user device is further configured to: select an event in the second list, and automatically

select, in response to selecting an event in the second list, an equivalent event in the first list (See col. 5, lines 46-59)

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the user device is further configured to: select an event in the second list, and automatically select, in response to selecting an event in the second list, an equivalent event in the first list as taught by Dekoning et al in the claimed invention Watson et al in order to compare the objects stored on both lists (See col. 5, lines 41-42).

6. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,591,337 to Dekoning et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,601,185 to Bass et al.

a. As per claim 15, Dekoning et al teaches the claimed invention was described above. However, Dekoning fails to teach wherein for each network element identifier, a total number of alarms associated with each of the plurality of network elements.

Bass et al teaches a secondary alarm filtering. Furthermore, Bass et al teaches wherein for each network element identifier, a total number of alarms associated with each of the plurality of network elements (See col. 4, lines 35-38)

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate for each network element identifier, a total number of alarms associated with each of the plurality of network elements as taught by Bass et al

in the claimed invention of Dekoning et al in order to identify fault discovered in a communication systems (See col. 1, lines 18-20).

7. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,591,337 to Dekoning et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,601,185 to Bass et al as applied to claim 15 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,764,955 to Doolan.

a. As per claim 16, Dekoning et al in view of Bass et al teaches the claimed invention as described above. However, Dekoning et al in view of Bass et al fails to teach wherein the processor is further configured to: provide, for each network element identifier, a value indicating a quantity of major alarms associated with a respective network element, and provide, for each network element identifier, a second value indicating a quantity of minor alarms associated with a respective network element.

Doolan teaches a gateway for using legacy telecommunications network element equipment with a common management information protocol. Furthermore, Doolan teaches providing, for each network element identifier, a value indicating a quantity of major alarms associated with a respective network element, and providing, for each network element identifier, a second value indicating a quantity of minor alarms associated with a respective network element (See col. 10, lines 56-58)

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate provide, for each network element identifier, a value

Art Unit: 2141

indicating a quantity of major alarms associated with a respective network element, and provide, for each network element identifier, a second value indicating a quantity of minor alarms associated with a respective network element as taught by Doolan in the claimed invention of Dekoning et al in view of Bass et al in order to define the level of severity (See col. 10, lines 56-58

8. Claims 19 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,591,337 to Dekoning et al in view of U.S. Patent U.S. Patent No. 5,764,955 to Dolan.

a. As per claims 19 and 21, Dekoning et al teaches the claimed invention as described above. However, Dekoning et al fails to teach providing for each network element identifier, a value representing a number of escalated alarms associated with a respective network element.

Doolan teaches a gateway for using legacy telecommunications network element equipment with a common management information protocol. Furthermore, Doolan teaches providing for each network element identifier, a value representing a number of escalated alarms associated with a respective network element (See col. 49-56)

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate providing for each network element identifier, a value representing a number of escalated alarms associated with a respective network

Art Unit: 2141

element as taught by Doolan in the claimed invention Dekoning et al in order to define the level of severity (See col. 10, lines 56-58)

9. Claims 17-18 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,591,337 to Dekoning et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,301,336 to Branton, Jr. et al.

a. As per claim 17, Dekoning et al teaches the claimed invention as described above. However, Dekoning et al fails to teach wherein to provide, for each network element identifier, a value representing a number of users monitoring a respective network element.

Branton Jr. et al teaches a method and apparatus for testing components in a communications system. Furthermore, Branton, Jr. et al teaches wherein to provide, for each network element identifier, a value representing a number of users monitoring a respective network element (See col. 3, lines 62-65).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate wherein to provide, for each network element identifier, a value representing a number of users monitoring a respective network element as taught by Branton, Jr. et al in the claimed invention of Dekoning et al in order to allow users to monitor testing of network elements from various locations. (See col. 3 line 67 and col. 4, line 1).

Art Unit: 2141

b. As per claim 18, Dekoning et al teaches the claimed invention as described above. However, Dekoning et al fail to teach wherein the processor is further configured to: provide, in response to selecting the value representing the number of users monitoring a network element, contact information for each user.

Branton, Jr. et al teaches wherein the processor is further configured to: provide, in response to selecting the value representing the number of users monitoring a network element, contact information for each user (See col. 11, lines 20-25)

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate wherein the processor is further configured to: provide, in response to selecting the value representing the number of users monitoring a network element, contact information for each user as taught by Branton, Jr. et al in order to receive messages indicating that an error has occurred for a particular network element (See col. 11, lines 20-21).

c. As per claim 22, Dekoning et al teaches the claimed invention as described above. However, Dekoning et al fails to teach wherein the list further includes a number of users currently monitoring each of the plurality of network elements.

Branton, Jr. et al teaches wherein the list further includes a number of users currently monitoring each of the plurality of network elements (See col. 3, lines 62-65).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate wherein the list further includes a number of users currently monitoring each of the plurality of network elements as taught by Branton, Jr.

Art Unit: 2141

et al in the claimed invention of Dekoning et al in order to allow users to monitor testing of network elements from various locations. (See col. 3 line 67 and col. 4, line 1).

10. Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,591,337 to Dekoning et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,343,290 to Cossins et al.

a. As per claim 23, Dekoning et al teaches the claimed invention as described above. However, Dekoning et al fails to teach wherein the list further includes at least one of a total number- of alarms associated with each of the plurality of network elements, a total number of trouble tickets associated with each of the plurality of network elements, a total number of held alarms associated with each of the plurality of network elements, and a network element type indication for each of the plurality of network elements.

Cossins et al teaches wherein the list further includes at least one of a total number of alarms associated with each of the plurality of network elements (See col. 11, lines 43-46), a total number of trouble tickets associated with each of the plurality of network elements (See col. 3, lines 20-24), a total number of held alarms associated with each of the plurality of network elements (See col. 12, lines 31-36), and a network element type indication for each of the plurality of network elements (See col. 9, lines 36-41).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate wherein the list further includes at least one of a total number- of alarms associated with each of the plurality of network elements, a total number of trouble tickets associated with each of the plurality of network elements, a total number of held alarms associated with each of the plurality of network elements, and a network element type indication for each of the plurality of network elements as taught by Cossins et al in the claimed invention of Dekoning et al in order to view, monitor, configure and manage a telecommunication network (See col. 3, lines 17-19).

11. Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,591,337 to Dekoning et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,343,290 to Cossins et al and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,301,336 to Branton, Jr. et al.

a. As per claim 25, Dekoning et al teaches the claimed invention as described above. However, Dekoning et al fails to teach wherein the list further includes at least one of a value representing a number of escalated alarms associated with each of the plurality of network elements, a value representing a number of users currently monitoring each of the plurality of network elements, a total number of alarms associated with each of the plurality of network elements, a total number of trouble tickets associated with each of the plurality of network elements, a total number of held alarms associated with each of the plurality of network elements, and a network element type indication for each of the plurality of network elements.

Cossins et al teaches a value representing a number of escalated alarms associated with each of the plurality of network elements, a total number of alarms associated with each of the plurality of network elements (See col. 11, lines 43-46), a total number of trouble tickets associated with each of the plurality of network elements, a total number of held alarms associated with each of the plurality of network elements (See col. 3, lines 20-24), and a network element type indication for each of the plurality of network elements(See col. 9, lines 36-41). However, Cossins et al fails to teach a value representing a number of users currently monitoring each of the plurality of network elements

Branton, Jr. et al teaches a value representing a number of users currently monitoring each of the plurality of network elements (See col. 3, lines 62-65). It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate a value representing a number of users currently monitoring each of the plurality of network elements as taught by Dekoning et al in view of Cossins et al in order to allow users to monitor testing of network elements from various locations. (See col. 3 line 67 and col. 4, line 1).

12. Claims 27, 31, and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,343,290 to Cossins et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,427,170 to Sitaraman et al.

Art Unit: 2141

a. As per claims 27, 31 and 35, Cossins et al teaches the claimed invention as described above. Furthermore, Cossins et al teaches wherein the network devices include network elements (See col. 3, lines 42-44). However, Cossins et al fails to teach wherein the network devices include points of presence.

Sitaraman et al teaches an integrated IP address management. Furthermore, Sitaraman teaches wherein the network devices include points of presence (See abstract, lines 3-4).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate wherein the network devices include points of presence as taught by Sitaraman et al in the claimed invention of Cossins et al in order to provide users with access to the data communication network (See col. 6, lines 25-26).

13. Claims 42 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,343,290 to Cossins et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,154,212 to Eick et al.

a. As per claims 42 and 47, Cossins et al teaches the claimed invention as described above. However, Cossins et al fails to teach wherein the network map is a three-dimensional network map.

Eick et al teaches a method and apparatus for constructing network interface. Furthermore, Eick et al teaches wherein the network map is a three-dimensional network map (See abstract, lines 21-25)

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate wherein the network map is a three-dimensional network map as taught by Eick et al in the claimed invention of Cossins et al in order to generate many different types of network view (See abstract, lines 21-25).

14. Claims 49, 51-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,343,290 to Cossins et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,154,212 to Eick et al.

a. As per claim 49, Cossins et al teaches a system for managing a network heaving a plurality of network elements, comprising: a user device configured to provide a user with a list of network management options, transmit a response to a selection of an option by the user, a request for current network information, provide the user with current network information according to the selected option; and a server configured to receive the request for current network information and transmit current network information to the user device (See abstract, lines 2-14). Furthermore, Cossins et al teaches wherein the options include a network element diagnostic option (See col. 4, lines 18-22), a network summary option (See col. 11, lines 55-60) and a geographical

Art Unit: 2141

network management option (See col. 3, lines 31-35). However, Cossins et al fails to teach wherein the options include a three-dimensional network management option.

Eick et al teaches Eick et al teaches a method and apparatus for constructing network interface. Furthermore, Eick et al teaches wherein the options include a three-dimensional network management option (See abstract, lines 21-25).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate wherein the options include a three-dimensional network management option as taught by Eick et al in the claimed invention of Cossins et al in order to generate many different types of network view (See abstract, lines 21-25).

b. As per claim 51, Cossins et al in view of Eick et al teaches the claimed invention as described above. Furthermore, Cossins et al teaches wherein the user device is configured to: provide, in response to a selection of the network summary option, a list of network element identifiers associated with the plurality of network elements, each network element identifier being associated with a state indication (See col. 20, lines 36-44 and col. 21, lines 22-25).

c. As per claim 52, Cossins et al in view of Eick et al teaches the claimed invention as described above. Furthermore, Cossins et al teaches wherein the user device is configured to: associate, in response to a selection of the geographical network management option, events in the network with one of the plurality of network devices,

Art Unit: 2141

and provide a geographical map, the geographical map displaying locations of each of the plurality of network devices and indicating which of the plurality of network devices are associated with at least one event (See col. 5, lines 18-31).

d. As per claim 53, Cossins et al in view of Eick et al teaches the claimed invention as described above. Furthermore, Cossins et al teaches wherein the user device is configured to: associate, each of the plurality of network elements with one of a plurality of logical planes, and provide a network map, the network map displaying relationships between the plurality of logical planes and those network elements associated with the plurality of logical planes (See col. 10, lines 13-29). However, Cossins et al fails to teach a selection of the three-dimensional network management option.

Eick et al teaches Eick et al teaches a method and apparatus for constructing network interface. Furthermore, Eick et al teaches wherein the selection is a three-dimensional network management option (See abstract, lines 21-25).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate wherein the selection is a three-dimensional network management option as taught by Eick et al in the claimed invention of Cossins et al in order to generate many different types of network view (See abstract, lines 21-25).

15. Claim 50 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Patent No. 6,343,290 to Cossins et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,154,212 to Eick et al as

Art Unit: 2141

applied to claim 49 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,591,337 to Dekoning et al.

a. As per claim 50, Cossins et al in view of Eick et al teaches the claimed invention as described above. However, Cossins et al in view of Eick et al fails to teach wherein the user device is configured to: provide, in response to a selection of the network element diagnostic option, a first list of events occurring in the network, and simultaneously provide a second list of events occurring in the network, the second list comprising a predetermined number of most recent events.

Dekoning et al teaching a method and apparatus for caching objects in a disparate management environment. Furthermore, Dekoning et al teaches wherein the user device is configured to: provide, in response to a selection of the network element diagnostic option, a first list of events occurring in the network (See col. 5, lines 24-40), and simultaneously provide a second list of events occurring in the network (See col. 3, lines 13-15), the second list comprising a predetermined number of most recent events (See col. 6, lines 1-8).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate The wherein the user device is configured to: provide, in response to a selection of the network element diagnostic option, a first list of events occurring in the network, and simultaneously provide a second list of events occurring in the network, the second list comprising a predetermined number of most recent events as taught by Dekoning et al in the claimed invention of Cossins et al in

view of Eick et al in order to manage a plurality of subsystems within an information network (See col. 1, lines 45-47)

Conclusion

16. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U.S. Patent No. 6,385,204 to Hoefelmeyer et al teaches a network architecture and call processing system.

U.S. Patent No. 6,044,372 to Rothfus et al teaches a method and apparatus for publishing information to a communications network and enabling subscriptions to such information.

U.S. Patent No. 6,636,891 to Leclair et al teaches methods and apparatus for controlling an input and output device over the internet.

17. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Djenane M Bayard whose telephone number is (703) 305-6606. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00 AM-4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on (703) 305-4003. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.


Application/Control Number: 09/702,303
Art Unit: 2141

Page 23

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Djenane Bayard

December 24, 2003


RUPAL DHARIA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER